



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/607,771	06/27/2003	Lisa Keren Mentz Sievers	11045-3	6434

7590 10/20/2004

DANIEL B. SCHEIN, PH.D., ESQ.  
P.O. BOX 28403  
SAN JOSE, CA 95159

EXAMINER

GREEN, BRIAN

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

3611

DATE MAILED: 10/20/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

# Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/607,771

Applicant(s)

SIEVERS, LISA KEREN MENTZ

Examiner

Brian K. Green

Art Unit

3611

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

## Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

## Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 17 September 2004.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

## Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 10-13 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-9 and 14-20 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

## Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 27 June 2004 is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☒ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

## Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

## Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)                        | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)                     |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)               | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____  |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____  | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                                    |

## DETAILED ACTION

### *Election/Restrictions*

Applicant's election without traverse of Species II. (figures 5,6) in the reply filed on Sept. 17, 2004 is acknowledged.

Claims 10-13 have been withdrawn from further consideration pursuant to 37 CFR 1.142(b) as being drawn to a nonelected species, there being no allowable generic or linking claim. Election was made **without** traverse in the reply filed on Sept. 17, 2004.

### *Drawings*

The drawings are objected to because in figure 6 each of the figures must be separately labeled, i.e. Fig. 6A, Fig. 6B. Corrected drawing sheets in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. Any amended replacement drawing sheet should include all of the figures appearing on the immediate prior version of the sheet, even if only one figure is being amended. The figure or figure number of an amended drawing should not be labeled as "amended." If a drawing figure is to be canceled, the appropriate figure must be removed from the replacement sheet, and where necessary, the remaining figures must be renumbered and appropriate changes made to the brief description of the several views of the drawings for consistency. Additional replacement sheets may be necessary to show the renumbering of the remaining figures. The replacement sheet(s) should be labeled "Replacement Sheet" in the page header (as per 37 CFR 1.84(c)) so as not to obstruct any portion of the drawing figures. If the changes are not accepted by the examiner, the applicant will

Art Unit: 3611

be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

### ***Specification***

The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities: The title of the invention is too long.

Appropriate correction is required.

### ***Claim Objections***

Claims 2 and 6-8 are objected to because of the following informalities: In claim 2, line 1 "said sphere" should be "said spherical ornament". In claim 6, line 2, "the spherical circumference" should be "the circumference of the spherical ornament". In regard to claim 7, line 2, "the sphere" should be "the spherical ornament". In regard to claim 8, line 3, "said sphere" should be "said spherical ornament". Appropriate correction is required.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

Claims 3-8 and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

In claims 3 and 6, it is not clear how a spherical ornament can have three sides, i.e. how can a sphere have sides. In claim 18, line 5, it is not clear which message field the applicant is referring to.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 14 and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by “Antenna Balls”.

“Antenna Balls” shows a spherical ornament having a first message (AMOCO) and a second message (the message located directly below AMOCO) which is different from the first message. In regard to claim 19, the detachable mount is considered to be the antenna in which the antenna balls are releasably attached to. The “Antenna Balls” was posted on Oct. 15, 1997 on the internet as shown by the website Wayback Machine.

Claims 14 and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by “Antenna Ball Promotions”.

“Antenna Ball Promotions” shows a spherical ornament having a first message (102.1 or MEP) and a second message (the message located directly below 102.1 or MEP) which is different from the first message. In regard to claim 19, the detachable mount is considered to be the antenna in which the antenna balls are releasably attached to. The “Antenna Ball Promotions” was posted on January 24, 2001 on the internet as shown by the website Wayback Machine.

Claims 14,19, and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Lund (U.S. Design Patent 294,843).

Lund shows in figures 1-6 a spherical ornament having a first message (eyes) and a second message (mouth/smile or the imitation stitching on the ball) which is different from the first message. In regard to claims 19 and 20, Lund shows in figures 1-6 that the mount includes a base (the projection on the clip), a shaft (the spring), and a surface attachment (the clip).

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-8 and 15-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over “Antenna Balls” .

In regard to claims 1-8, the “Antenna Balls” does not disclose making a dark field with at least one star superimposed thereon and a striped field proximate to the dark field. “Antenna Balls” discloses the use of two messages but does not disclose the specific images of the messages defined by the applicant. It would have been an obvious matter of design choice to modify “Antenna Balls” by making a dark field with at least one star superimposed thereon and a striped field proximate to the dark field since it is considered within one skilled in the art to make the indicia define any message as desired. Further, the specific messages defined on the ball are not considered to be a patentable feature. In regard to claim 2, it is conventional in the art that antenna balls are about 1 to 2 inches in diameter. Further, the applicant defines in the

Art Unit: 3611

specification, page 6, lines 10-11 that antenna balls have a diameter of between 1 and 2 inches.

In regard to claims 3-8 and 15-18, it would have been an obvious matter of design choice to modify "Antenna Balls" by making the first and second messages as defined in these claims since it is considered within one skilled in the art to make the indicia define any message as desired. Further, the specific messages defined on the ball are not considered to be a patentable feature.

Claims 1-8 and 15-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over "Antenna Ball Promotions".

In regard to claims 1-8, the "Antenna Ball Promotions" does not disclose making a dark field with at least one star superimposed thereon and a striped field proximate to the dark field. "Antenna Ball Promotions" discloses the use of two messages but does not disclose the specific images of the messages defined by the applicant. It would have been an obvious matter of design choice to modify "Antenna Ball Promotions" by making a dark field with at least one star superimposed thereon and a striped field proximate to the dark field since it is considered within one skilled in the art to make the indicia define any message as desired. Further, the specific messages defined on the ball are not considered to be a patentable feature. In regard to claim 2, it is conventional in the art that antenna balls are about 1 to 2 inches in diameter. Further, the applicant defines in the specification, page 6, lines 10-11 that antenna balls have a diameter of between 1 and 2 inches. In regard to claims 3-8 and 15-18, it would have been an obvious matter of design choice to modify "Antenna Ball Promotions" by making the first and second messages as defined in these claims since it is considered within one skilled in the art to

Art Unit: 3611

make the indicia define any message as desired. Further, the specific messages defined on the ball are not considered to be a patentable feature.

Claims 1-9, and 15-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lund (U.S. Design Patent No. 294,843) .

In regard to claims 1-8, Lund does not disclose making a dark field with at least one star superimposed thereon and a striped field proximate to the dark field. Lund discloses the use of two messages but does not disclose the specific images of the messages defined by the applicant. It would have been an obvious matter of design choice to modify Lund by making a dark field with at least one star superimposed thereon and a striped field proximate to the dark field since it is considered within one skilled in the art to make the indicia define any message as desired. Further, the specific messages defined on the ball are not considered to be a patentable feature. In regard to claim 2, Lund does not disclose whether the ball is between about 1 to 2 inches in diameter. It would have been obvious to one in the art to modify Lund by making the sphere between 1 and 2 inches since this would create a sphere that is reasonably sized and would allow the device to be used in a wider range of locations. Further, it is considered within one skilled in the art to make the ball any diameter as desired. In regard to claims 3-8 and 15-18, it would have been an obvious matter of design choice to modify Lund by making the first and second messages as defined in these claims since it is considered within one skilled in the art to make the indicia define any message as desired. Further, the specific messages defined on the ball are not considered to be a patentable feature.



Claims 1-9 and 14-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lusebrink (U.S. Patent No. 3,320,920) in view of Katz et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,176,099).

Lusebrink shows in figures 1-6 a spherical ornament having a mount that includes a base (20), a shaft (12) that is flexible and resilient, and a surface attachment (the suction cup or the adhesive 16). Lusebrink discloses the idea of varying the color of the spherical ornament, see column 2, lines 25-35. Lusebrink does not disclose placing first and second messages on the spherical ornament. Katz et al. shows in figures 4 and 5 the idea of placing a first message (40a) on the ball and a second message (40b) on the ball. In view of the teachings of Katz et al. it would have been obvious to one in the art to modify Lusebrink by attaching first and second messages to the spherical ornament since this would allow additional information to be conveyed to observers of the ornament. In regard to claims 1-8, Lusebrink in view of Katz et al. does not disclose making a dark field with at least one star superimposed thereon and a striped field proximate to the dark field. It would have been an obvious matter of design choice to modify Lusebrink in view of Katz et al. by making a dark field with at least one star superimposed thereon and a striped field proximate to the dark field since it is considered within one skilled in the art to make the indicia define any message as desired. Further, the specific messages defined on the ball are not considered to be a patentable feature. In regard to claim 2, it is conventional in the art that antenna balls are about 1 to 2 inches in diameter. Further, the applicant defines in the specification, page 6, lines 10-11 that antenna balls have a diameter of between 1 and 2 inches. In regard to claims 3-8 and 15-18, it would have been an obvious matter of design choice to modify Lusebrink in view of Katz et al. by making the first and second messages as defined in these claims since it is considered within one skilled in the art to

Art Unit: 3611

make the indicia define any message as desired. Further, the specific messages defined on the ball are not considered to be a patentable feature.

Claims 1-9 and 14-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lund (U.S. Design Patent No. 294,843) in view of Katz et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,176,099).

Lund shows in figures 1-6 a spherical ornament having a mount that includes a base (the projection on the clip), a shaft (the spring), and a surface attachment (the clip). Lund discloses the idea of placing a face on the spherical ornament. Lund does not disclose placing first and second messages on the spherical ornament. Katz et al. shows in figures 4 and 5 the idea of placing a first message (40a) on the ball and a second message (40b) on the ball. In view of the teachings of Katz et al. it would have been obvious to one in the art to modify Lund by attaching first and second messages to the spherical ornament since this would allow additional information to be conveyed to observers of the ornament. In regard to claims 1-8, Lund in view of Katz et al. does not disclose making a dark field with at least one star superimposed thereon and a striped field proximate to the dark field. It would have been an obvious matter of design choice to modify Lund in view of Katz et al. by making a dark field with at least one star superimposed thereon and a striped field proximate to the dark field since it is considered within one skilled in the art to make the indicia define any message as desired. Further, the specific messages defined on the ball are not considered to be a patentable feature. In regard to claim 2, it is conventional in the art that antenna balls are about 1 to 2 inches in diameter. Further, the applicant defines in the specification, page 6, lines 10-11 that antenna balls have a diameter of between 1 and 2 inches. In regard to claims 3-8 and 15-18, it would have been an obvious

Art Unit: 3611

matter of design choice to modify Lund in view of Katz et al. by making the first and second messages as defined in these claims since it is considered within one skilled in the art to make the indicia define any message as desired. Further, the specific messages defined on the ball are not considered to be a patentable feature.

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Cook, Sutton, and Halbig teach the use of antenna balls. Lakin, Imperato, and Conway teach the use of a display that includes a coiled spring shaft.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Brian K. Green whose telephone number is (703) 308-1011. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 7am-3:30pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Lesley Morris can be reached on (703) 308-0629. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Art Unit: 3611

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



BRIAN K. GREEN  
PRIMARY EXAMINER

Bkg  
Oct. 18, 2004